

Response
Application No. 10/069,523
Attorney Docket No. 020238

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. No amendment has been proposed. It is respectfully submitted that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated December 19, 2005.

As to the Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner maintains the following rejections:

1) claims 1-3 and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by

Soiferman; and

2) claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cilingiroglu.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

In response to Applicants' argument that as clearly shown in Fig. 2 of Soiferman the insulation layers 17 and 18, and not the energizing plate 10 or the sensors 12, are disposed on the respective surfaces of the BUT 16, the Examiner takes the position that the insulation layers 17 and 18 are considered as part of the circuit board under test. See, lines 3-4, page 3 and lines 6-9, page 5 of the Action.

Response
Application No. 10/069,523
Attorney Docket No. 020238

However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's position above is unreasonable, since Soiferman clearly discloses that the plate 10 includes the insulation layer 17.

More specifically, according to col. 2, lines 51-53 and col. 4, lines 24-26 of Soiferman:

One side of the plate must have an insulation layer to prevent electrical shorting with the BUT.

One side of the plate must have an insulation layer 17 (FIG. 2) to prevent electrical shorting with the BUT 16.

In addition, Soiferman clearly discloses in col. 2, lines 63-64 and col. 4, lines 58-59 that insulation layer 18 must be between the sensor board 12 and the BUT 16.

Moreover, as clearly shown in Fig. 2 of Soiferman, the plate 10 and the insulation layer 17, and the sensor board 12 and the insulation layer 18, each have the same length, respectively, whereas the BUT 16 has a shorter length.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's position that insulation layers 17 and 18 are part of the BUT 16 in Soiferman is clearly without merit.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the applied reference of Soiferman fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of claim 1 concerning *a conductive member disposed on one of the surfaces of said circuit board and to be supplied with an inspection signal; means for*

Response
Application No. 10/069,523
Attorney Docket No. 020238

supplying the inspection signal to said conductive member; and a plurality of cells disposed on the other surface of said circuit board.

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/jl